

REMARKS

This Amendment is submitted in reply to the Office Action mailed on May 31, 2006, which action was made final. Entry of this amendment is requested because it addresses points previously considered by the Examiner (namely, the application of identifiers to locations/cables relative to reading steps and devices) and is believed to place the case in condition for allowance or better condition for an appeal.

Claims 1-5-, 7-14, 16-18 and 20 again stand rejected as being anticipated by *Collier*. Claims 6, 15 and 19 stand rejected as being obvious over *Collier*.

Collier is concerned with identifying physical cables and their locations in a fixed space relative to an original plan so that, for example, if the installer were to return 10 years later he or she would be able to identify a cable is and its physical route.

The method defined by claim 1 concerns connectivity management so as to be able to identify and trace connections --something well known to regularly change over time. Claim 1 addresses this problem by providing cables and locations with machine-readable identifiers, then locating one of those cables at one of those locations, and then reading and generating a list of cable locations based on the read identifiers, with the list stored for later retrieval. Specifically, claim 1 has been amended to expressly recite the order of the claimed steps. This order was inherent in claim 1 at least as between the “providing” and “reading” steps, but in view of the Examiner’s having expressed general agreement with the points argued in Applicant’s prior response, the amendments to claim 1 are believed to not raise new issues or require further consideration. Consequently, entry of the amendments to claim 1 are believed to overcome *Collier*.

In the cable management system of claim 10, the identifier reading device is operable on identifiers “physically coupled to” both “a cable or cables” and “a location or locations.” As previously noted on the record, *Collier* labels the carrier prior to disposition at a location. The carrier at any given location thus may bear the identify of a location record; however, the location itself lacks an identifier other than on the cable

itself that physically identifies the location. Accordingly, the “physically coupled” identifier makes express the features previously brought to the Examiner’s consideration, and distinguish the claims more clearly over *Collier*.

In the cable management system of claim 19, machine-readable identifiers are again recited as “physically applied to the ports and the cables in said structured cabling system” thereby distinguishing over *Collier*.

In the cable management method of claim 20, an express order of steps is now recited, which Applicants understand has been previously considered and is a recognized point of departure from the disclosure of *Collier*.

The transition word in each of independent claims 1, 10, 19 and 30 has been changed from “including” to instead recite “comprising” in accordance with U.S. practice. This is not believed to introduce any new issues that require further consideration or searching.

Applicants respectfully request entry of this amendment and allowance of all claims.

Dated: July 31, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By David Leason
David Leason

Registration No.: 36,195
DARBY & DARBY P.C.
P.O. Box 5257
New York, New York 10150-5257
(212) 527-7700
(212) 527-7701 (Fax)
Attorneys/Agents For Applicant